

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification and certain claims are amended by the present response to correct minor grammatical and idiomatic informalities. The changes made to the specification and claims are deemed to be self-evident from the original disclosure, and thus are not deemed to raise any issues of new matter.

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. Claims 1-16 and 23-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,388,654 to Platzker et al. (herein “Platzker”) in view of U.S. patent 6,084,939 to Tamura. Claims 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Platzker in view of Tamura and further in view of U.S. patent 5,504,544 to Dreyer et al. (herein “Dreyer”).

Addressing the above-noted rejections, each of those rejections is traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of independent claims 1, 23, 24, and 31 is amended by the present response to clarify subject matter recited therein. Specifically, claim 1 clarifies that the projection surface on which a predetermined projection image is displayed has the projection “from a rear side”, that the writing surface on which an image can be drawn is from “a front side”, and further that a photographing part that photographs an image drawn on the writing surface is “from the rear side”. The other independent claims 23, 24, and 31 are also amended to recite similar features.

Such subject matter is believed to be fully supported for example in Figure 10A in the present specification. As shown as a non-limiting example in Figure 10A a projection image is displayed on a writing field or a screen through projection by a projector 4 from a rear side. Further, pictures or characters can be drawn on the writing field of screen 1 from a front side thereof, and can further be photographed by a camera 7 from the rear side.

The features clarified in the above-noted claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The primary reference to Platzker discloses a device in which projection on the screen, writing onto the screen, and photographing the screen are all performed from the *same* side of the screen, see for example Figure 2A therein.

In contrast to those teachings in Platzker, in the claims as currently written the projection and photographing operations are performed from a side opposite to a side from which the writing is performed. With such a structure and operation in the claims as currently written an operator can write a picture or characters on the writing field freely without obstructing the projection or photographing operations to the writing field.

In such ways, the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over the teachings in Platzker.

Moreover, no teachings in Tamura or Dreyer can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Platzker, and thus the pending claims further distinguish over those further rejections.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that each of amended independent claims 1, 23, 24, and 31, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
SNS:smi

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

I:\ATTY\SNS\22's\220147\220147US-AM.DOC